

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 are rejected.

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 11-16, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Keller, U.S. Patent No. 6,636,959 (hereinafter “Keller”). Claims 5-7, 17-19, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller in view of “Register Renaming and Dynamic Speculation: an Alternative Approach,” by Mayan Moudgill and Keshav Pingali (hereinafter “Moudgill”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 11-16, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Keller. Keller discloses a line predictor to cache alignment information for instructions (*See Abstract*).

Applicants contend that Keller fails to teach or suggest determining a set of rename resources needed for the trace cache line on a *per-packet basis*, as recited in claims 1, 11 and 22.

The Office Action cites a passage from Keller that states:

Finally, the line is terminated if the instructions within the line update a predefined maximum number of destination registers. This termination condition is set such that the maximum number of register renames that map unit 30 may assign during a clock cycle is not exceeded. In the present embodiment, 4 renames may be the maximum.

(Keller, Column 23, lines 22-27).

No indication is given how the number of destination registers used is determined, as the Office Action admits by stating that the determination is inherent (*i.e.* not present but implied). Keller certainly does not disclose performing this determination on a per-packet basis. Thus, an element of claims 1, 11, and 22 are not disclosed by Keller. Therefore, claims 1, 11, and 22 and by their dependency claims 2-4, 8-10, 12-16, and 20-21, are not anticipated by Keller.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5-7, 17-19, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller in view of Moudgill. Moudgill discloses a mechanism implementing register renaming, dynamic speculation, and precise interrupts (*See Abstract*).

Neither Keller, Moudgill, nor any combination of the two teach or suggest determining a set of rename resources needed for the trace cache line on a per-packet basis and comparing the set of rename resources needed for the provisional trace cache line to a rename capacity, as claimed in claims 1, 11, and 22, and by their dependency claims 5-7, 17-19, and 23.

Therefore, claims 5-7, 17-19, and 23, are not obvious under Keller in view of Moudgill.

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Application No.: 09/752,573
Amendment dated: May 9, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated February 9, 2005

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17 to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: May 9, 2005

By: Stephen T. Neal
Stephen T. Neal
(Reg. No. 47,815)
Attorneys for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON
333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501